

B) Remarks:

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is noted. Although claim 2 has now been incorporated into claim 3, nevertheless the term “the” has been removed before “access” in line 7 of claim 2. Also, in claim 7 line 6, the word “management” has been removed, claim 7 now being incorporated entirely into claim 8.

In view of the nearly cited art of Dornbush et al. and C-lab, and the rejection based thereon, Applicants have incorporated the subject matter of claims 2 and 7 respectively into claims 3 and 8.

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected as being unpatentable by Dornbush et al. in view of C-lab, the Examiner stating in paragraph 10 that accessing includes accessing at least one course component learning experience selected from a group consisting of learn, complete course work, demonstrate knowledge, self-evaluation and share course work, the Examiner pointing to particular portions of Dornbush.

Dornbush, for example in Figure 3, indicates that a course has an end time. However, Applicants’ claim 3 to the contrary calls for “complete course work” as the description of an action, an activity that the learner would participate in. All of Applicants’ component learning experiences are activities that the learner participates in.

The concept of “course end time” disclosed by Dornbush is not an activity, but in fact, is completely unrelated to the concept of “complete course work” as described and claimed in the current application. Thus Dornbush does not describe any such selection of activities. In fact, the current application does not teach a “course end time” at all, since the preferred implementation allows learners to work at their own pace. Dornbush does not suggest and does not teach the concept of “complete course work” as an activity to be carried out. Nor does Dornbush suggest or teach the “learn” section. Accordingly, Dornbush does not even suggest the possible activity selections pointed as component learning experiences in claim 3 of the present application.

With regard to the rejection of claim 4, Dornbush does not teach “display of concepts” as a possible selection. Accordingly Dornbush does not teach the entire group consisting of course objective outline, provision of learning materials, tools for navigating selected portions of the host learning management system and display of concepts. Therefore, Dornbush cannot be said to render claim 4 of the present application to be obvious for this reason and also for the reasons previously stated with regard to claim 3.

With regard to claim 5, the Examiner asserts that Dornbush teaches at least one of the group activities claimed which consists of engaging interaction, website visit, real-world simulation, hard copy documentation and electronic collaborative communication. However, Dornbush does not teach all the elements of claim 5 of the current application. Claim 5 requires all of items to be included in the group and further claims that the learner may access at least one of them while accessing the “display of concepts” section. It is therefore considered that the Examiner’s rejection

is improper or erroneous because the rejection implies that Dornbush only needs to teach one element or one part of claim 5 in order to establish that claim 5 is obvious in its entirety. However, it is Applicant's position that Dornbush must teach all of these elements, not just one or a few, in combination in order to render the invention obvious. Dornbush does not teach engaging interaction, website visit, or real-world simulation. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that Dornbush cannot render claim 5 of the present application to be obvious.

In conclusion therefore, Dornbush, even in combination with C-lab, does not and cannot render claims 3, 4 and 5 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. In addition the same reasoning applies with regard to claims 8, 9 and 10.

Claim 12 has been canceled.

Accordingly in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is now believed that this application has been placed in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration with notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CAROTHERS AND CAROTHERS



Floyd B. Carothers
Attorney for Anthony G. Matous and
Bruce A Moser
Fort Pitt Commons, Suite 500
445 Fort Pitt Boulevard
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

FBC:jkc
Reg. No. 24,252
(412) 471-3575
(412) 281-2180
Pittpatent@aol.com

ET 793408805 US

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with
the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express
Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 1, 2005

CAROTHERS AND CAROTHERS

